

## PATENT APPLICATION

## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In Re the Application of:

SCHULZE, JR.

Serial No.: Not Yet Assigned

Filed: Filed Herewith

Atty. File No.: 2937-9

For: "MERCHANDISING USING  
CONSUMER INFORMATION  
FROM SURVEYS"

Group Art Unit:

Examiner:

INFORMATION DISCLOSURE  
STATEMENT"EXPRESS MAIL" LABEL NUMBER: EM458067571 US  
DATE OF DEPOSIT: April 4, 1997I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THIS NEW APPLICATION AND  
THE DOCUMENTS REFERRED TO AS ENCLOSED THEREIN ARE  
BEING DEPOSITED WITH THE UNITED STATES POSTAL  
SERVICE "EXPRESS MAIL POST OFFICE TO ADDRESSEE"  
SERVICE UNDER 37 C.F.R. 1.10 ON THE DATE  
INDICATED ABOVE AND IS ADDRESSED TO THE  
COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS,  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20231.Assistant Commissioner for Patents  
Washington, D.C. 20231TYPED OR PRINTED NAME: Gilles BovenkampSIGNATURE: *Ginger Bovenkamp*

Dear Sir:

Pursuant to Applicant's duty of disclosure under 37 CFR § 1.56 and 37 CFR §§ 1.97-1.98, Applicant hereby provides a copy of each of the documents identified on the enclosed PTO Form 1449, although Applicant does not admit that any of such documents, alone or in any combination, is considered to be material to patentability as defined in 37 CFR § 1.56(b). Moreover, the inclusion of these documents is not to be construed as an admission by Applicant that each such document is prior art as to the above-identified patent application.

Respectfully submitted,

SHERIDAN ROSS P.C.

By: *David F. Zinger*David F. Zinger  
Registration No. 29,127  
1700 Lincoln Street  
Suite 3500  
Denver, Colorado 80203  
(303) 863-9700Date: *April 4, 1997*

#2  
DC  
8-20-91

37 CFR §1.56(a) and (b)  
DUTY TO DISCLOSE INFORMATION MATERIAL  
TO PATENTABILITY

(a) A patent by its very nature is affected with a public interest. The public interest is best served, and the most effective patent examination occurs when, at the time an application is being examined, the Office is aware of and evaluates the teachings of all information material to patentability. Each individual associated with the filing and prosecution of a patent application has a duty of candor and good faith in dealing with the Office, which includes a duty to disclose to the Office all information known to that individual to be material to patentability as defined in this section. The duty to disclose information exists with respect to each pending claim until the claim is cancelled or withdrawn from consideration, or the application becomes abandoned. Information material to the patentability of a claim that is cancelled or withdrawn from consideration need not be submitted if the information is not material to the patentability of any claim remaining under consideration in the application. There is no duty to submit information which is not material to the patentability of any existing claim. The duty to disclose all information known to be material to patentability is deemed to be satisfied if all information known to be material to patentability of any claim issued in a patent was cited by the Office or submitted to the Office in the manner prescribed by §§1.97(b)-(d) and 1.98. However, no patent will be granted on an application in connection with which fraud on the Office was practiced or attempted or the duty of disclosure was violated through bad faith or intentional misconduct. The Office encourages applicants to carefully examine:

(1) prior art cited in search reports of a foreign patent office in a counterpart application, and

(2) the closest information over which individuals associated with the filing or prosecution of a patent application believe any pending claim patentably defines, to make sure that any material information contained therein is disclosed to the Office.

(b) Under this section, information is material to patentability when it is not cumulative to information already of record or being made of record in the application, and

(1) It establishes, by itself or in combination with other information, a prima facie case of unpatentability of a claim; or

(2) It refutes, or is inconsistent with, a position the applicant takes in:

(i) Opposing an argument of unpatentability relied on by the Office, or

(ii) Asserting an argument of a patentability.

A prima facie case of unpatentability is established when the information compels a conclusion that a claim is unpatentable under the preponderance of evidence, burden-of-proof standard, giving each term in the claim its broadest reasonable construction consistent with the specification, and before any consideration is given to evidence which may be submitted in an attempt to establish a contrary conclusion of patentability.\*

\*Note, 37 CFR §1.97(h) states: "The filing of an information disclosure statement shall not be construed to be an admission that the information cited in the statement is, or is considered to be, material to patentability as defined in §1.56(b)."